

## **REMARKS**

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed on December 11, 2007 and is being filed pursuant to a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) as provided under 37 CFR 1.114. At the time the Examiner mailed the Final Office Action claims 1, 4-9 and 23-28 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicants have: 1) amended claim 1; 2) added no new claims; and 3) canceled no claims. As such, claims 1, 4-9 and 23-28 are now pending. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now represented.

### **Claim Rejections**

#### **35 U.S.C. 102(e) Rejections**

The Office action rejected claims 23-28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Enger, et al., U.S. Publication 2005/0020325 (hereinafter "Enger").

Enger teaches a folding portable device with a main body element 102 coupled to a flip cover body element 104 (i.e., the display). (Paragraph 0020; Figs. 1-2). The portable device has 3 configurations: folded closed, the display unfolded in a longitudinal position, and the display unfolded in a lateral position. (Paragraph 0021). In other words, the display may be unfolded along hinges on along an x or y axis of the main body, with the final display position extending into the z-direction (See, e.g., Figs 1-2). Therefore, the display can be rotated 90 degrees along they x-axis for one configuration and along the y-axis for another configuration.

Enger does not teach the data processing device and the display rotated substantially 90 degrees in relation to the second physical orientation. Rather, only the display is rotated opened—not the data processing device and display. Claim 1 of the current application recites, in part, "wherein the first physical orientation comprises the data processing device and the display rotated substantially 90 degrees in relation to the second physical orientation".

Therefore, Enger does not include all the limitations of claim 1 and thus does not anticipate claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection for claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 24-28 ultimately depend from independent claim 23 and thus include all the limitation of claim 23. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections for claims 24-28 should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 23.

#### 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

The Office action rejected claims 1 and 4-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finke-Anlauff, U.S. Patent 6,850,226 (hereinafter "Finke-Anlauff") in view of Saarinen, U.S. Patent 6,882,335 (hereinafter "Saarinen"). The Office action also rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finke-Anlauff in view of Saarinen in further view of Enger, et al., U.S. Publication 2005/0020325 (hereinafter "Enger").

Claim 1 requires, in part, a first and second plurality of glyphs on a corresponding plurality of physical keys of an alphanumeric keyboard. Applicant has also amended claim 1 to recite, in part, "wherein at least one of the first and second plurality of glyphs is highlighted when illuminated from an optical source".

Finke-Anlauff teaches an electronic device with keyboard and movable display. However, Finke-Anlauff does not teach a first or second plurality of glyphs on a corresponding plurality of physical keys of an alphanumeric keyboard. The Examiner has cited to Saarinen to provide such limitation; however, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Saarinen teaches a display apparatus which displays an image of a keyboard on the display. Saarinen does not teach a first and second plurality of glyphs on a corresponding plurality of physical keys of an alphanumeric keyboard, as required by claim 1. Therefore, the combination of Enger in view of Saarinen does not teach all the limitations of claim 1, and thus does not make claim 1 obvious. Furthermore, displaying images on a display is significantly

different from, and involves significantly different technologies than, highlighting glyphs on a physical keyboard. Thus, one skilled in the art would not think to combine the teachings of Finke-Anlauff and Saarinen as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Finke-Anlauff in view of Saarinen does not make claim 1 obvious, and thus claim 1 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 4-8 ultimately depend from independent claim 1 and thus include all the limitation of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections for claims 4-8 is overcome for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 1.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finke-Anlauff in view of Saarinen in further view of Enger. Using similar reasoning as above, Finke-Anlauff nor Saarinen teach a first and second plurality of glyphs on a corresponding plurality of physical keys of an alphanumeric keyboard wherein at least one of the plurality of glyphs are highlighted when illuminated from an optical source. Furthermore, Engel does not teach a first and second plurality of glyphs on a corresponding plurality of physical keys of an alphanumeric keyboard that are highlighted when illuminated from an optical source.

Enger teaches a folding portable device with a display which opens up from a main body. (Figs 1-2). The keypad is adaptable and is set to function as a numeric keypad when a portrait interrupt is generated. Enger states that these adaptable keypads are described in greater detail in U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058223 (Tracy et al.) and incorporates the application by reference. Tracy teaches an adaptable keypad where the conductors in the shape of keypad characters are electrically energized causing a corresponding pattern in an electrically active ink layer to appear. (See, e.g., Abstract, Fig.1). The device includes a PCB layer 102 having switch circuits 103, a driving layer 108 (having an insulating layer with conductor elements disposed thereon), an electronically activated ink layer 110, and a transparent conductor layer 112. (Paragraph 0012).

Enger does not teach a first and second plurality of glyphs on a corresponding plurality of physical keys of an alphanumeric keyboard wherein at least one of the plurality of glyphs is highlighted when illuminated from an optical source. Instead of glyphs that highlight when illuminated by light, Enger teaches conductor elements on a driving layer which energize an electrically activated ink layer. There is no glyph that is illuminated by an optical source.

Claim 9 has been amended to require, in part, a first and second plurality of glyphs on a corresponding plurality of physical keys of an alphanumeric keyboard wherein at least one of the first and second plurality of glyphs is highlighted when illuminated from an optical source. Therefore, the combination of Finke-Anlauff in view of Saarenen in further view of Enger do not make claim 9 obvious.

In light of the comments above, the Applicants respectfully request the allowance of all claims.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Thomas C. Webster at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 04/10/08

/Thomas C. Webster/  
Thomas C. Webster  
Reg. No.: 46,154

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085  
(408) 720-8300